

REMARKS

The Examiner's action dated August 27, 2009, has been received, and its contents carefully noted.

Appreciation is expressed to Examiners Shaver and Wood for their courtesy and constructive assistance during the personal interview held with undersigned counsel on November 24, 2009.

* * * *

SUMMARY OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

During that interview, the Examiner discussed with undersigned counsel that adding the language of the needle body being a "unitary-one piece" construction along with adding language regarding the circumferential nature of the grooves and corresponding non-magnetic packing material to claim 19 would set the claim in condition for allowance, pending an updated search.

* * * *

By the present amendment, claim 19 has been amended in precisely the manner discussed with the Examiners, it being noted that the additions discussed related, in fact, to the needle, and not the valve body.

In addition, undersigned counsel has taken the liberty of further amending claim 19 for the sake of clarity by providing a more positive recitation of the seat and the needle.

Support for the additions to the end of the claim 19 will be found in original claim 5 and in the specification at page 3, lines 1-7, at page 7, last three lines to page 8, line 5 and at page 9, lines 6-10. Of course, the fact that the grooves are formed by

machining the external radial surface of needle body 32 inherently requires that the needle body be a single piece.

Of course, the "body" discussed during the interview is the body of needle 3 and claim 19 has been amended to specify that it is the needle that is of unitary, one-piece construction, that has an external radial surface provided with grooves and comprises non-magnetic filling material in the grooves.

As was discussed in detailed during the interview, even if the teachings of the applied references could be combined, the references cannot be considered to fairly suggest a valve having the needle body structure now defined in claim 19.

All of the pending dependent claims should be considered allowable in view of their dependencies from claim 19.

In view of the foregoing, it is requested that the objection and rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn, that claims 19-35 be allowed and that the application be found in allowable condition.

Appln. No. 10/551,283
Amd. dated November 27, 2009
Reply to Office Action of August 27, 2009

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By /jmf/
Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:smb
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\L\lavl\Merabet2\Pto\2009-11-27 Amendment AF.doc